



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,782	11/18/2003	Dwayne Need	MFCP.110238	4543

45809 7590 02/28/2006
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
(c/o MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
2555 GRAND BOULEVARD
KANSAS CITY, MO 64108-2613

EXAMINER

PATEL, MANGLESH M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 02/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/715,782	Applicant(s) NEED ET AL.	
	Examiner Manglesh M. Patel	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>March 8, 2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: IDS filed on March 8, 2004 to the application filed on November 18, 2003.
2. Claims 1-32 are pending. Claims 1, 13, 25 and 30 are independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on March 8, 2004 has been entered, and considered by the examiner.

Drawings

4. The examiner has accepted the Drawings filed on November 18, 2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews (U.S. 6,259,435, filed Aug 25, 1998) in view of Adler (U.S. 5,812,818, filed Nov 17, 1994) further in view of Knauff (U.S. 6,981,217, with provisional date Dec 8, 1998).

Regarding Independent claims 1 and 25, Matthews discloses a computerized method for processing a user input event having a code associated therewith, said method comprising: receiving notification of said input event, said notification including the associated code (column 1, lines 1-52 and fig 7-9, wherein keyboard detects the key-press event and translates the key information or code); Matthews fails to teach a text converting component. Adler discloses determining whether a text converting component is interested in performing a conversion action with respect to said input event (column 2, lines 11-33 & fig 17 # 650 and 654 and fig 18, wherein the input even is associated with a facsimile device which sends the text to a translation program to determine if the text is supported for the target translation); Adler fails to teach the obfuscation of code based on the determination stage. However Knaft discloses obfuscating said code from an application when the text converting component is interested in performing a conversion action with respect to said input event (column 2, lines 1-63, wherein text information is obfuscated based on a match with a predefined set of words. However Alder and Knaft combined disclose the obfuscation of text based on applicability of conversion to a particular target language). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the obfuscation of text for an active program. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the active application from performing an incorrect conversion by encrypting the input from the application. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Knaft with Adler and Matthews for the benefits of preventing incorrect translations for active text converting applications by performing the obfuscation of text input based on application support.

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding Dependent claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Matthews discloses wherein said user input event is communicated via a keyboard, a screen with user input capability, a mouse, and/or a device with voice input capacity (paragraphs 35-65 and fig 1, wherein fig 1 displays a keyboard for the user input event).

Regarding Dependent claims 3,15 and 26, Matthews discloses wherein said code identifies at least a portion of a letter, a character, an ideograph or a symbol associated with said user input event (Fig 2, column 1, lines 37-60, wherein fig 2 shows a keyboard with letter, character and symbols).

Regarding Dependent claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Matthews fails to teach a text converting component. Adler discloses communicating said code to the application when the text converting component is not interested in processing said user input event (fig 18, column 9, lines 28-59 and column 10, lines 1-23). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the obfuscation of text for an active program. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the active application from performing an incorrect conversion by encrypting the input from the application. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Knauff with Adler and Matthews for the benefits of preventing incorrect translations for active text converting applications by performing the obfuscation of text input based on application support.

Regarding Dependent claims 5 and 18, Matthews fails to teach a text converting component.

Adler discloses wherein the text converting component is configured to convert said code to a standard for coding text (column 2, lines 10-33). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the obfuscation of text for an active program. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the active application from performing an incorrect conversion by encrypting the input from the application. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Knaft with Adler and Matthews for the benefits of preventing incorrect translations for active text converting applications by performing the obfuscation of text input based on application support.

Regarding Dependent claims 6 and 19, Matthews fails to teach a text converting component.

Adler discloses wherein said standard is Unicode (column 2, lines 10-33). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the obfuscation of text for an active program. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the active application from performing an incorrect conversion by encrypting the input from the application. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Knaft with Adler and Matthews for the benefits of preventing incorrect translations for active text converting applications by performing the obfuscation of text input based on application support.

Regarding Dependent claim 7, which depends from claim 1, Matthews fails to teach a text converting component. Adler discloses revealing said code to the application in response to a request to disclose said code (fig 17, column 8, lines 21-65). At the time of the invention it

Art Unit: 2178

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the obfuscation of text for an active program. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the active application from performing an incorrect conversion by encrypting the input from the application. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Knauft with Adler and Matthews for the benefits of preventing incorrect translations for active text converting applications by performing the obfuscation of text input based on application support.

Regarding Dependent claim 8, which depends on claim 1, Matthews fails to teach a text converting component. Adler discloses determining whether a computer component is interested in processing said input event (column 8, lines 21-65). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the obfuscation of text for an active program. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the active application from performing an incorrect conversion by encrypting the input from the application. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Knauft with Adler and Matthews for the benefits of preventing incorrect translations for active text converting applications by performing the obfuscation of text input based on application support.

Regarding Dependent claim 9, which depends on claim 8, Although Matthews discloses the obfuscation of keyboard input he fails to disclose the obfuscation of text based on a condition. Alder teaches this condition to be the active application determining the processing of the input text. Knauft teaches obfuscating said code from an application when the computer component is interested in processing said input event (column 2, lines 1-63). At the time of the invention it

Art Unit: 2178

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the obfuscation of text for an active program. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the active application from performing an incorrect conversion by encrypting the input from the application. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Knauft with Adler and Matthews for the benefits of preventing incorrect translations for active text converting applications by performing the obfuscation of text input based on application support.

Regarding Dependent claim 10, which depends on claim 9, Matthews fails to teach a text converting component. Adler discloses notifying the application that the computer component is interested in processing said input event (fig 17, column 8, lines 21- 65). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the obfuscation of text for an active program. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the active application from performing an incorrect conversion by encrypting the input from the application. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Knauft with Adler and Matthews for the benefits of preventing incorrect translations for active text converting applications by performing the obfuscation of text input based on application support.

Regarding Dependent claims 11, 23 and 29, Matthews fails to teach a text converting component. Adler discloses wherein said computer component is an input method editor (column 4, lines 50-67). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the obfuscation of text for an active program. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the active application from performing an incorrect conversion by

Art Unit: 2178

encrypting the input from the application. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Knauft with Adler and Matthews for the benefits of preventing incorrect translations for active text converting applications by performing the obfuscation of text input based on application support.

Regarding Dependent claim 12, which depends on claim 8, Matthews discloses

wherein said computer component is configured to allow a user to enter at least a portion of a letter, a character, an ideograph or a symbol associated with a desired language (column 1, lines 27-60, wherein the input includes characters and symbols).

Regarding Independent claim 13, Matthews discloses an input manager configured to interact with said one or more text converting components and said one or more applications, wherein said input manager is configured to receive notification of an input event (column 1, lines 1-32 and fig 7-9, wherein keyboard detects the key-press event and translates the key information or code); Matthews fails to teach a text converting component. Adler discloses a computer system for processing a user input event having a code associated therewith, the system comprising: one or more text converting components (column 2, lines 11-73 # 650 and 654, wherein the text conversion components include a translator for translating the source language which is different than the target language); one or more applications (fig 17, wherein the other application includes the conversion to ASCII using OCR); Adler fails to teach the obfuscation of the data. Knauft discloses said notification including the associated code, and wherein said input manager is further configured to obfuscate said code from the one or more applications when said one or

Art Unit: 2178

more text converting components are interested in performing a conversion action with respect to said input event (column 2, lines 1-63, wherein text information is obfuscated based on a match with a predefined set of words. However Alder and Knauft combined disclose the obfuscation of text based on applicability of conversion to a particular target language). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the obfuscation of text for an active program. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the active application from performing an incorrect conversion by encrypting the input from the application. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Knauft with Adler and Matthews for the benefits of preventing incorrect translations for active text converting applications by performing the obfuscation of text input based on application support.

Regarding Dependent claim 14, which depends on claim 13, Matthews discloses wherein said code is generated by a driver associated with an input device (column 2, lines 1-10).

Regarding Dependent claim 16, which depends on claim 13, Matthews fails to teach the input associated with a language. Adler discloses wherein said user input event is communicated via an input device that is not configured according to a desired language (Fig 17, column 8, lines 21-65). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the obfuscation of text for an active program. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the active application from performing an incorrect conversion by encrypting the input from the application. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Knauft with Adler and Matthews for the benefits of preventing incorrect translations

Art Unit: 2178

for active text converting applications by performing the obfuscation of text input based on application support.

Regarding Dependent claim 17, which depends on claim 13, Matthews fails to teach a text converter. Adler discloses wherein said input manager is further configured to communicate said code to one or more applications when none of the text converters are interested in processing said user input event (fig 17, column 8, lines 21-65). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the obfuscation of text for an active program. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the active application from performing an incorrect conversion by encrypting the input from the application. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Knauff with Adler and Matthews for the benefits of preventing incorrect translations for active text converting applications by performing the obfuscation of text input based on application support.

Regarding Dependent claim 20, which depends on claim 13, Matthews fails to teach a text converter. Adler discloses wherein said input manager is further configured to notify the one or more applications that at least one of said text converting components is interested in performing a conversion action with respect to said input event (fig 7, column 8, lines 21-65). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the obfuscation of text for an active program. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the active application from performing an incorrect conversion by encrypting the input from the application. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Knauff

with Adler and Matthews for the benefits of preventing incorrect translations for active text converting applications by performing the obfuscation of text input based on application support.

Regarding Dependent claim 21, which depends on claim 13, Matthews fails to teach a text converter. Adler discloses wherein said input manager is further configured to reveal said code to one or more of said applications in response to a request to disclose said code (column 8, lines 21-65, fig 17). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the obfuscation of text for an active program. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the active application from performing an incorrect conversion by encrypting the input from the application. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Knaft with Adler and Matthews for the benefits of preventing incorrect translations for active text converting applications by performing the obfuscation of text input based on application support.

Regarding Dependent claim 22, which depends on claim 13, Matthews fails to teach a text converter. Adler discloses one or more computer components (Fig 17 # 628 and 654 and column 8, lines 21-65). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the obfuscation of text for an active program. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the active application from performing an incorrect conversion by encrypting the input from the application. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Knaft with Adler and Matthews for the benefits of preventing incorrect translations for active text converting applications by performing the obfuscation of text input based on

application support.

Regarding Dependent claims 24 and 28, Matthews fails to disclose the obfuscation of code based on a condition. Adler specifies the condition which is based on the active applications ability to perform a translation. Knaft discloses wherein said input manager is configured to obfuscate said code from the one or more applications when one or more of said computer components are interested in handling said input event (column 2, lines 1-63). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the obfuscation of text for an active program. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the active application from performing an incorrect conversion by encrypting the input from the application. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Knaft with Adler and Matthews for the benefits of preventing incorrect translations for active text converting applications by performing the obfuscation of text input based on application support.

Regarding Dependent claim 27, which depends on claim 25, Matthews fails to teach a text converter. Adler discloses a computer component interface component for determining whether one or more computer components are interested in handling said user input event (column 8, lines 13-50). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the obfuscation of text for an active program. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the active application from performing an incorrect conversion by encrypting the input from the application. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Knaft with Adler and Matthews for the benefits of preventing incorrect translations

for active text converting applications by performing the obfuscation of text input based on application support.

Regarding Independent claim 30, Matthews discloses a computer system for processing a user input event having a code associated therewith, the system comprising: means for receiving notification of a user input event having a code associated therewith, said notification including the associated code (column 1, lines 1-52 and fig 7-9, wherein keyboard detects the key-press event and translates the key information or code); means for converting said code to a value indicating a character or a symbol (fig 2, column 1, lines 37-60, wherein the input includes a character or symbol associated with the keyboard information); Matthews fails to disclose one or more applications associated with the input event. Adler discloses one or more applications (Fig 17, where the translator is the application associated with the input event, although the input event in Adler is associated with a facsimile device, its still provides an input relating to text for translation); Adler fails to teach the obfuscation of the input. Knauff discloses means for interacting with said one or more applications and said converting means in response to notification of said user input event, wherein said means for interacting are configured to obfuscate said code from the one or more applications when said converting means are interested in performing a conversion action with respect to said input event (column 2, lines 1-63, wherein text information is obfuscated based on a match with a predefined set of words. However Alder and Knauff combined disclose the obfuscation of text based on applicability of conversion to a particular target language). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the obfuscation of text for an active program.

The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the active application from performing an incorrect conversion by encrypting the input from the application. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Knauft with Adler and Matthews for the benefits of preventing incorrect translations for active text converting applications by performing the obfuscation of text input based on application support.

Regarding Dependent claim 31, which depends on claim 30, Matthews fails to teach an editing tool associated with the input. Adler discloses further comprising means for editing an input method (column 2, lines 1-32, wherein the OCR text is in ASCII format thereby providing the editing with any text editor prior to translation). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the obfuscation of text for an active program. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the active application from performing an incorrect conversion by encrypting the input from the application. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Knauft with Adler and Matthews for the benefits of preventing incorrect translations for active text converting applications by performing the obfuscation of text input based on application support.

Regarding Dependent claim 32, which depends on claim 31, Matthews fails to teach an editing tool associated with the input. Adler discloses further comprising means for editing an input method (column 2, lines 1-32, wherein the OCR text is in ASCII format thereby providing the editing with any text editor prior to translation). Adler fails to teach the obfuscation of the text prior to performing the translation output. Knauft discloses wherein said means for interacting

Art Unit: 2178

are further configured to obfuscate said code from the one or more applications when said editing means are interested in handling said input event (column 2, lines 1-63). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the obfuscation of text for an active program. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the active application from performing an incorrect conversion by encrypting the input from the application. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Knaft with Adler and Matthews for the benefits of preventing incorrect translations for active text converting applications by performing the obfuscation of text input based on application support.

It is noted that any citation [[s]] to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. [[See, MPEP 2123]]

Conclusion

Other Prior Art Cited

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Mudusuru (U.S. Pub 2004/0268257) discloses "Method, Apparatus, And System For Providing Multi-Language Character Strings Within A Computer"
- Carew et al. (U.S. Pub 2003/0154069) discloses "Computerized System And Method For Converting Selected Text Between Languages"
- Odom et al. (U.S. 6,141,116) discloses "System And Method For Secured Transformation Of Data Over Telephone Communication System"

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manglesh M. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on M, W 6 am-3 pm T, TH 6 am-2pm, Fr 9am-6pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Manglesh M. Patel

Patent Examiner

February 17, 2006


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER